

# CMER – July 12, 2001

NAME	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Brian Fransen	Weyerhaeuser	<a href="mailto:brian.fransen@weyerhaeuser.com">brian.fransen@weyerhaeuser.com</a>
Marc Hayes	WDFW	<a href="mailto:hayesmph@dfw.wa.gov">hayesmph@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Deborah Lindley	DNR	<a href="mailto:deborah.lindley@wadnr.gov">deborah.lindley@wadnr.gov</a>
Mary Raines	NWIFC	<a href="mailto:mraines144@aol.com">mraines144@aol.com</a>
Mark Hunter	WDFW	<a href="mailto:huntemah@dfw.wa.gov">huntemah@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Helen Bresler	Ecology	<a href="mailto:hbre461@ecy.wa.gov">hbre461@ecy.wa.gov</a>
Dave Schuett-hames	NWIFC	<a href="mailto:dschuett@nwifc.wa.gov">dschuett@nwifc.wa.gov</a>
Dave Parks	WADNR	<a href="mailto:dave.parks@wadnr.gov">dave.parks@wadnr.gov</a>
Mark Mobbs	QIN	<a href="mailto:mmobbs@quinault.org">mmobbs@quinault.org</a>
Blake Rowe	Longview Fibre Co	<a href="mailto:bsrowe@longfibre.com">bsrowe@longfibre.com</a>
Jeffrey Clark	Weyerhaeuser	<a href="mailto:jeffrey.clark@weyerhaeuser.com">jeffrey.clark@weyerhaeuser.com</a>
Darin Cramer	WADNR	<a href="mailto:darin.cramer@wadnr.gov">darin.cramer@wadnr.gov</a>
Bruce Lippke	U of WA	<a href="mailto:blippke@u.washington.edu">blippke@u.washington.edu</a>
Terry Jackson	WDFW	<a href="mailto:jackstbj@dfw.wa.gov">jackstbj@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Mike Liquori	Campbell Group	<a href="mailto:mliquori@campbellgroup.com">mliquori@campbellgroup.com</a>
Doug Martin	WFPA	<a href="mailto:martin1696@aol.com">martin1696@aol.com</a>
Timothy Quinn	WDFW	<a href="mailto:quinntq@dfw.wa.gov">quinntq@dfw.wa.gov</a>
L.N. Pete Peterson	UCUT	<a href="mailto:lpet2@aimcomm.com">lpet2@aimcomm.com</a>
Joe Zisa	USFWS	<a href="mailto:joe_zisa@fws.gov">joe_zisa@fws.gov</a>

**Adaptive Management Administrator:** Jeff Grizzel indicated that candidates have been interviewed for the adaptive management administrator position. A candidate has been identified and references are being checked. If everything works out and an offer is made and accepted, the person may be on board by August 1.

**Scientific Review Committee:** Two proposals have been reviewed for the Scientific Review Committee. The combined proposal from UW/WSU was identified as a preferred option and details are being negotiated. FFR Policy will review this recommendation and final approval will be at the discretion of the Forest Practices Board – perhaps at their August 8 meeting. Concerns were raised regarding how to use UW/WSU for CMER project contracts without creating a conflict of interest with the SR process. CMER endorsed the recommendation of the combined UW/WSU proposal.

**CMER Documents Report and Website Update:** Heather Rowton outlined the system she is creating to catalog CMER documents that could eventually be posted on a CMER website (handout available). There was much discussion about what should appear on a CMER website versus what should be distributed internally. A recommendation for what would appear on a website is as follows: CMER minutes; Final CMER publications; RFP's/RFQQ; Final Scopes of Work; Inter-Agency Agreements; and Progress Reports. Items must have CMER approval before they are posted on the website. CMER also approved posting outside final research reports on the website at the request of SAGs.

DNR will manage and update the website after it is up and running. This will likely be the responsibility of the assistant to the AM Administrator. Jeff Grizzel is checking with DNR to

see if this will work.

SAG co-chairs need to review the document list prepared by Heather (available over e-mail) and identify documents that have been approved by CMER to post on the website. Also, SAGs need to complete the information needed for each item (i.e. date, author, key words). SAG co-chairs should submit this information to Heather prior to the next CMER meeting, (August 27<sup>th</sup>). This information is necessary to ensure that the search feature on the website functions properly.

**CMER Spending Plan:** Handout from Grizzel “Table 1” updating the 4-year spending plan for CMER. Periodic updates will be done. \* Grizzel requested stakeholders to provide information on any other AM funding/expenditures that are not accurately represented or included in the table.

**Watershed Analysis:** Mark Hunter provided an update on the subgroup that has been working on what to do with Watershed Analysis (WA). The subgroup is asking for guidance/clarification from CMER/Policy on what they should do.

Questions: Should the subgroup just do what is called for in the FFR or should they take a broader look at the role of WA given the elements of FFR? What is the priority for this work versus other CMER projects?

WDFW is not interested in continuing to work on WA. Dave Parks (DNR) has offered to take over co-chairing the WA subgroup as a replacement for Mark Hunter but Mark indicated that he was willing to continue to serve as co-chair. Dave Parks will join the WA group. CMER directed the subgroup to analyze the role of WA and figure out what parts of WA are covered by FFR, what parts are not, and what to do with WA (may be different from directions given in FFR). The subgroup recommendation will come to CMER.

**Project prioritization** A review of the next round of projects proposed for funding is in process. Quinn and Martin proposed using 2 rounds of review/ranking:

Round 1 Criteria

- Impact to resources
- Does this have substantial management/rule implication
- Level of significance of scientific uncertainty
- Relationship/link to Schedules L-1/L-2

Round 2 Criteria

- Review round 1 rankings in light of estimated cost of ranked projects (cost includes both total dollars and duration of study)

18 people were present at the CMER meeting including 10 core members. Grizzel and Dave Schuett-hames plan to abstain from voting. The remaining 16 present will vote on the priorities with core members resolving disputes (Note: later in the meeting it was decided to defer voting until the next meeting). Each SAG provided handouts listing proposed projects. Much discussion ensued.

Quinn, Martin and Grizzel provided direction to the committee to consider the 13 projects already funded and on “Table 1” as top priorities, including their funding beyond FY-02.

Specific designs/proposals must still be approved by CMER, but the general commitment has been made for these 13 projects. Discussion of projects for this round of prioritization will be focused on “new” proposals not expansions or extensions of the first 13 proposals.

Voting was deferred to the next meeting. Each SAG needs to score its project proposals against the 3 ranking criteria (See Above) using high, medium, low rankings prior to the next CMER meeting. SAG’s are required to submit all projects they can initiate by the end of FY-02. Include cost estimates by year, for each project where information is available. This will indicate project duration as well. Full project list (existing and proposed) should be delivered to Grizzel by 7/25. A short list of new ’02 projects with evaluation against ranking criteria, cost estimates, and duration should be delivered to Grizzel (or his replacement) by 8/15.

#### **Reports on existing projects.**

- LWAG - Resampling of RMZ study sites. LWAG is recommending no peer review of the existing study design because it is important to replicate the original study. If current science indicates new/additional methods should be included, then these new methods should be peer reviewed before they are implemented. LWAG is proposing to issue the RFP and have potential contractors include their review/recommendations on new methods. After a contractor is selected, the final study design will be finalized and any new methods peer reviewed. After discussion, CMER decided to accept most of LWAG’s recommendation. CMER required that top proposals (one or more) received by LWAG in response to RFP, get peer review on new methods before a contractor is selected. The results of the peer review would be used to help in the contractor selection.
- PIP Subgroup – recommended CMER approve the protocol for collecting PIP data this summer without further peer review. CMER approved.
- PIP Subgroup – recommended funding resampling of sites sampled in the past (all westside) for \$35,000.00. CMER approved this proposal. CMER also approved all up to \$40,000.00 to fund eastside data collection for PIP’s.

CMER funded studies must include a plan that provides for QA/QC. All plans should include a clause that ensures future access to study sites for QA/QC purposes.

Next CMER meeting 8/27/01 – 10:00 am.